

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OCTOBER 16, 1997**

PROJECTS REVIEWED

Lincoln Reservoir
Convention Center Design Principles (SDC discussion)
Olmsted Interpretive Exhibit

Convened: 8:00 AM

Adjourned: 12:30PM

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Barbara Swift, Chair
Moe Batra
Carolyn Darwish
Robert Foley
Gerald Hansmire
Jon Layzer

STAFF PRESENT

Marcia Wagoner
Peter Aylsworth
Rebecca Walls

101697.1 Project: **LINCOLN RESERVOIR**
 Phase: Pre-Design Briefing
 Presenters: John Curtin, Seattle Public Utilities
 Darlene Flynn, SPU Public Involvement
 Barbara Goldstein, Seattle Arts Commission
 Jeff Girven, The Berger Partnership
 Lowell Warren, KCM Consultants
 Beth Purcell, Department of Parks and Recreation
 Time: 1 hr. (0.3%)

The Seattle area has nine open water reservoirs which are targeted to receive covers in the near future. Water quality problems attributed to open reservoirs include a loss of chlorine residual, algae growth, sporadic taste and odor problems, potential introductions of airborne contaminants (primarily from birds), and regulations. These are the rationale for covering water reservoirs. All new reservoirs built since the mid 1970's have been required to be covered. In 1994, Seattle was required to develop a plan for covering all remaining open reservoirs. The plan was approved by the Mayor and City Council in 1995 and by the Department of Health in 1996. A study was then initiated to evaluate reservoir sizing to determine if there was excess storage and whether or not some of the reservoirs could be reduced or eliminated. The study results indicated that total storage could be reduced by 70 million gallons. The recommended plan for the Lincoln reservoir is to rebuild it underground at approximately one half its current size with a solid cover. The City proposes to conduct public involvement separately at each reservoir site. This will begin with initial public meetings to gather information, followed by a report back to Council and the Mayor for further guidance. This project will continue to be a coordinated effort with the Parks Department, Neighborhood Planning, and other stakeholders.

Discussion:

- Darwish:** Regarding the reservoir cover; how will mold and algae issues be addressed given the darkness underneath the cover?
- Warren:** It hasn't been a problem in the past. There is typically enough movement and turnover to avoid that problem. There will be vents in the reservoir as well as access for cleaning equipment.
- Batra:** What will the level of seismic accommodation for this structure?
- Warren:** We are designing for zone 4 and using the 1997 codes. Significant seismic events might cause damage, but would not render the reservoir unusable. It will be designed well above the current standards.
- Batra:** I am concerned about small cracks developing from minor seismic conditions which might allow chemicals from landscape treatments to get into the reservoir and compromise the water quality.
- Warren:** We put a waterproof membrane over the reservoir to take care of contaminants getting into the water.
- Flynn:** On other sites with joint use by the water department and the parks department, there is always a memorandum of agreement about how the site is managed which takes such practices into consideration. When a park operates on top of a reservoir lid, it operates on agreed upon guidelines set by the water quality personnel. What

can and cannot be used in terms of park operation will be established in that agreement.

Warren: We also put in three distinct drainage systems. The roof is sloped and drains into a monitored system, wall drainage will also have a monitored system, and we also have an under-drain system to monitor groundwater or leakage.

Hansmire: Is the pump house being rebuilt as well?

Warren: We don't anticipate rebuilding it. We may need to add some room if we end up with storage tanks for hydrochloride. The pump-house will not change in appearance on the exterior.

Curtin: The community is interested in using the gate-house building for meeting space if it is not going to be used by the water department.

Foley: The public participation process in developing the master plan seems to have been very well organized. One design issue that may come up in getting master plan approved, is the aspect of the reservoir coming up higher than the parapet wall. It could significantly change the character of the space.

Warren: That is a good observation and is an issue that we have been trying to make the community aware of.

Flynn: Another design issue involves the community's perception of the reservoir as a water feature, which will change after it is hard lidded. The community has been interested in adding a water feature to the park that is symbolic of the use of the site.

Curtin: How would the commission suggest we proceed in terms of our next presentation?

Swift: I think that one of the things we would be interested in seeing is how you are going to sift out the ultimate goals and prioritize them into a set of design principles and guidelines that will then formulate how the site is used and designed. I also think that you need to think about the life-span of this project. Is it a 100 year effort or a 50 year effort? I say that with a particular regard to the development of the public amenities side and the park side with reference to the Olmsted tradition. I think one of the challenges will be meeting the immediate demands of today, while still really looking out for the future in terms of how the community is going to mature over the long-term. This can then be integrated into the historic context of the park.

Flynn: The community is very forward thinking and visionary with this project. The more design issues we can involve in the community process, the better. To add design changes after the public process is completed is disastrous to the public trust. I think that it is important that the Commission's involvement be integrated with the public process. One way to do that is to have your input in designing the parameters, principles, and goals that will guide the process and then let the community work within that. Another way to guide the process might be to have the Commission actually participate in some of the planning sessions.

Hansmire: What the Commission generally has trouble with on a project is when we don't understand how the alternatives were generated, not so much the solution. When we understand the process of getting to a solution, then we feel more comfortable in the solution. I would like you to come back and explain how you have developed the solution, the process you went through.

- Flynn:** There is a strong commitment to preserving the gate-house structure. We are essentially treating it as if it were listed as a historic structure.
- Curtin:** We should consider a presentation to the landmarks board.
- Swift:** It is a good idea to present to the landmarks board. Gail will be pleased with the amount of effort you have shown in integrating the public process, community groups, and the historical character of the site.
- Hansmire:** She was very concerned about the conservation of some of the key historical elements at the site.
- ACTION:** **Briefing only, no action required. The Commission appreciates the comprehensive approach taken by Seattle Public Utilities. The Commission also commends them on the artist selection process and openness to extensive artist involvement.**

101697.2 Project: **CONVENTION CENTER DESIGN PRINCIPLES**
 Phase: Commission Discussion
 Time: 1hr. (N/C)

The Commission discussed the Convention Center redesign efforts and the Urban Design Principles developed by the Washington State Convention and Trade Center. These principles are important tools for use in considering proposed improvements in the street vacation process. The principles should be tied directly to the physical form as well as to administration and use of the public space. Concern remains about the design of the seven blocks of straight walls adjoining the public space. Layzer suggested that a progress report style format be used with regards to the seven design principles as a way of continuing the Commission's involvement. This would allow an opportunity to show support for the design progress while still identifying where improvement needs to be focused. Layzer remarked that two remaining issues need to be addressed. These are programmatic uses and dealing with the boxes, or large blank facades fronting the public spaces. The Progress Report should be in letter form dealing with issues that need to be addressed while ensuring continued involvement with the Commission. Issues still to be addressed include the northwestern most column of the galleria cover, the blank panel walls, which could contain a history of Seattle, and the use of artists, primarily famous artists from this city. The Commission realizes the importance of this project as an opportunity for international exposure.

The first panel describes the 100 year existence of the Olmsted firms. It contains quotes of Frederick Law Olmsted Sr. and list sites of other Olmsted parks and projects. The second panel shows the parks and boulevards in Seattle. The third panel shows John C. Olmsted's desk top in 1903, what it might have looked like with field notes, letter to his wife, sketches, photos, etc. The fourth panel is about regreening Seattle and a history of park development in Seattle. The fifth panel is about Volunteer Park. The sixth panel describes Seattle's water system and how it relates to the parks. The six panels are an informative presentation of the Olmsted legacy in Seattle. Information on the panels will be presented in a hierarchical format with headlines, varying sizes of text blocks, and graphics

Layzer: This is a great in terms of providing documentation of the Olmsted legacy for the public. There is a lot of other planning history in Seattle and it would be great to have a repository for some of that as well. There are some interesting legacies in Seattle's planning that people could use to analyze current development decisions.

ACTION: Briefing only, no action required . The Commission greatly appreciates the presentation.

Action Items

Discussion Items

C. CENTRAL WATERFRONT REVIEW TEAM UPDATE: Layzer reported. OMP is trying to plan meetings regarding design elements.

SDC 101697 : July 1, 2002

- E. CONVENTION CENTER DESIGN COMMITTEE: A working session between commissioners and the design teams was set for October 22 to discuss the column at the northwest retail corner.
- F. WORLD TRADE CENTER BRIDGE AT BELL STREET: Subcommittee members Layzer, Sundberg, and Swift reported.
- G. RTA WORKING SESSION: November 6th
- H. KING STREET AREA IMPROVEMENTS: Commission discussion
- I. DESIGN REVIEW EVALUATION: Foley reported
- J. SYMPOSIUM OF NEIGHBORHOOD TRANSPORTATION PLANNING: Staff reported.